DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 561 TM 850 176

AUTHOR Malvetti, Aniello L.; And Others
TITLE The California Evaluation Improvement Program. A Statewide Effort in the Teaching of Evaluation.
PUB DATE 12 Oct 84
NOTE 20p.; Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evaluation Network/Evaluation Research Society (San Francisco, CA, October 10-13, 1984).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Assessment; *Education Service Centers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Utilization; Instructional Materials; Management Development; Needs Assessment; *Program Evaluation; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *California Evaluation Improvement Program; Evaluation Research

ABSTRACT

This document contains five symposium papers on the California Evaluation Improvement Program (EIP). Since 1974, a network of eight regional centers have annually assisted approximately 6,000 educators with educational program evaluation. Established to train middle management personnel to evaluate their own programs, the EIP centers now also evaluate programs, conduct research, perform needs assessments and develop proficiency tests. In "The California Evaluation Improvement Program: The State Perspective," Carolyn M. Fowle provides background on the beginning, development, and success of the EIP. Ronald P. Unruh discusses how Fresno Center meets school district needs in "The Management, Operation, and Staffing of an EIP Center." Using this same title Randall Cognetta describes the San Mateo Center program. In "Responding to Emerging Needs: The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)," Jack Thompson outlines the EIP Centers' services to this program. In "Developing Evaluation Teaching Materials," Aniello L. Malvetti summarizes development steps for training materials produced by the California Evaluation Improvement Center. (BS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED254561

THE CALIFORNIA EVALUATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
A STATEWIDE EFFORT IN THE TEACHING OF EVALUATION

A Symposium Presented at

The 1984 Joint Meeting of the Evaluation Research Society

and the Evaluation Network

San Francisco, California

October 12, 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. L. Malvetti

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Chair:

Aniello L. Malvetti, Sacramento County Office of Education

Presenters:

Carolyn M. Fowle, California State Department of Education

Ronald Unruh, Fresno County Office of Education

Randall Cognetta, San Mateo County Office of Education

Jack Thompson, Sonoma County Office of Education

Aniello L. Malvetti, Sacramento County Office of Education

Discussant:

Joe B. Hansen

ECIA, Chapter I Technical Assistance Center

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

TM 850 176

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE CALIFORNIA EVALUATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:

THE STATE PERSPECTIVE

Carolyn M. Fowle
California State Department of Education

The California Evaluation Improvement Program (EIP) began in 1974 and was funded for a three-year period under an ESEA Title V, Part C grant from the U.S. Office of Education. Title V, Part C monies were special flow-through funds which were allocated to all of the 50 states by the federal government for a three-year period for the purpose of improving local program evaluation competencies. The money could have been quickly dissipated had it been distributed to local educational agencies by the usual formula measure.

A survey of district and county offices in California revealed that 54 percent of the responding districts and 64 percent of the responding county offices indicated a desire to have program evaluation training available for their program staffs.

The funding and the need were thereby established. The next step was to develop an appropriate service delivery system. In California, county offices of education function as intermediate units between the state and local educational agencies. Therefore, under the direction of Dr. Alexander I. Law, Chief of the Office of Program Evaluation and Research, a network of Evaluation Improvement Regional Centers was established in eight county offices.

The counties selected were geographically distributed so that they could serve other neighboring counties. Each of the 58 counties in California was assigned to one of the eight regions. Thus, a network capable of serving 1,043 local educational agencies was established.

The purposes of the centers were to: 1) develop an increased desire and willingness to evaluate educational programs at the local level; 2) enhance individual evaluation competencies and institutional evaluation capabilities; 3) increase the number of schools and districts which effectively evaluate local

programs for local purposes, and 4) improve the use of evaluation data for program improvement at the local level.

To accomplish these objectives, a series of in-service training sessions were planned. It was soon discovered, however, that there was a dearth of materials for teaching local educational practitioners basic evaluation skills. The project staff developed new materials which are still being used in 1984 and are being marketed nationwide by the Educational Testing Service. A Program Evaluator's Guide was written by staff members who had background experience in both evaluation and curriculum and thereby it was closely tied to instructional programs. The Guide was generic in nature and could be applied to any educational program. In other words, it was not written for the evaluation of any particular categorically funded program though it could be used for that purpose.

The original target audience was district personnel with "middle management" responsibilities. By the end of the first year more than 1,300 persons had participated in four-day workshops.

And thereby the California Evaluation Improvement Program was established. After the initial three-year period funded by Title V, Part C, the funding was continued by the State of California. The program now is in its eleventh year. Since the "start-up" year, approximately 6,000 persons per year receive assistance in educational program evaluation from the eight regional centers.

What changes have been seen since the initial years of 1974-75?

1 - The hierarchal position of participants has changed. During the early years, top middle and middle management personnel were the consumers. Workshop participants now tend to be program managers, directors, principals, program specialists, resource teachers and classroom teachers.

2 - New training sessions are being tailored for special audiences, such as school board members, school site councils, school advisory committees and parents.

3 - Small group and individual consultations are being provided to those persons who earlier had the basic training.

4 - The number of sessions devoted to special topics, such as the Evaluation of Special Education Programs, and Program Implementation Evaluation are increasing.

And lastly, what has contributed to the success of the program? I shall cite a few features which, in my judgement, enable a three-year project to grow to a ten-year program:

1 - The concept and the organizational structure had the strong support of the County Superintendents' Area Council and the State Steering Committee in Curriculum (Assistant County Superintendents).

2 - The superintendents of the county offices in which the centers were located were committed to providing highly capable staff.

3 - The Regional Evaluation Improvement Centers are not perceived as an extended arm of the State Department of Education. Staff members are responsible to the county superintendent rather than to the Department and are encouraged to determine the needs of their own regions and establish their own implementation schedules.

4 - Each Regional Center has its own Advisory Committee composed of assistant superintendents from the counties it serves. The counties thereby tend to feel "ownership" of their centers.

5 - There is active participation of the personnel of each center in the development of workshop content. This not only

provides internalization of the content by the staffs, but also given uniformity of interpretation throughout the state.

6 - New materials are continuously being developed in response to new needs of the local educational agencies. Regional Centers frequently become sensitive to local needs more quickly than does the State Department.

7 - Each center trains a cadre of program evaluation trainers within its geographical area for further expansion of services.

8 - Regional Center personnel and other trained personnel in county and district offices are continuously available to provide local assistance in program evaluation.

9 - Coordination of the eight California Evaluation Improvement Centers is provided by the State Department of Education. An administrator in the Division or Planning, Evaluation, and Research is responsible for directing and coordinating the total effort.

10 - The program has been fortunate in the longevity of its individual staff members. The current State Director has been with the project since its inception and six of the eight original Regional Center Directors also began with the program in 1974. This condition has produced strong commitment within the entire staff.

THE MANAGEMENT, OPERATION, AND STAFFING OF AN EIP CENTER

Ronald P. Unruh
Fresno County Office of Education

The primary purpose of a California Evaluation Improvement Center is to teach educators how to evaluate their own programs for their own purposes. The scope of a Center's work is regional. The Fresno Center, for example, helps 11 different counties and some 300 school districts in Central California to evaluate their federal, state, and local programs. Since most of the school districts in Central California are small (50 to 1,500 A.D.A.), the Center sometimes contracts with districts to actually evaluate programs, conduct special research projects, perform needs assessments, and develop proficiency tests and other tests for the districts.

This part of the symposium will deal with how an EIP Center operates, is managed, and is staffed. The teaching function of the Center and how it relates to the Center's staff actually performing evaluation work for districts will be examined. Types of contracts and how the Center's Director negotiates contracts with districts will be discussed. The professional expertise and personal characteristics that the staff must have for the Center's operation to be successful and effective will be examined. The particular problems encountered and methods used in managing 50 to 60 evaluation contracts ($500 to $3,000 each) with school districts spread over thousands of square miles and still perform credible work will be explored.

FUNCTIONS OF AN EIP CENTER

The primary function of an EIP Center as it was first envisioned was to teach middle management personnel how to evaluate their own programs. Though the teaching function is still very important, it is no longer the only function of an EIP Center -- at least of the Fresno EIP Center. Actual performance of evaluation tasks has now become a primary function for the Fresno Center. The reasons for the change over the past seven years are: 1) the decline in both

federal and state support for the Centers; and 2) the demand for third-party competent evaluation services by local school districts.

With regard to the first reason, the amount of funds from federal and state sources to support the Centers began to decline almost from the first year of the project. Funded at the level of $30,000 in 1974-75, the Fresno EIP Center now receives $8,500 from state sources. Appropriately, the Director of the Fresno Center began to look to other sources of funding and began performing actual evaluation work for school districts in 1975.

With regard to the second reason for change in the Center's major function, school districts, especially small school districts, began to call the Fresno EIP Center for help in a number of different evaluation and measurement endeavors. In talking with district superintendents and project directors, it became apparent that what was needed was cost-effective, high quality, third-party evaluation services.

The need for help in small districts was especially great. Large unified school districts of 10,000 children or more often, but not always, have one or two skilled evaluators on staff. Small school districts have no one and, therefore, it is natural that they should look to the intermediate agency (i.e., County Office of Education) for assistance.

To meet the needs of all districts, several different types of program evaluation services are offered through the Fresno EIP Center. First, teaching evaluation techniques through the conduct of both three-day and mini workshops is offered. Second, independent program evaluations are performed with reference to such programs as Chapter I, Special Education, Migrant Education, bilingual/bicultural education, Teacher Education Computer (TEC) Centers, district-wide school reading, mathematics, and writing programs, and staff development programs. Third, the EIP staff helps school districts to determine their own goals and objectives for themselves and to conduct their own program

evaluations. Fourth, the Center conducts research projects in the area of educational experiments and innovations. For example, Special Education was an area where a special research project was undertaken. Fifth, the Center helps districts to monitor, audit, and validate evaluation procedures, compliance with state and federal laws, and the accuracy of evaluation findings. Sixth, the EIP Center helps districts to develop proficiency examinations in various subject areas and grade levels and develops its own item and objectives bank.

MANAGEMENT AND STAFFING OF THE CENTER

One might suspect that managing and staffing such a Center which is performing such a diverse number of job functions as described above might be a problem. The staff are required to be good workshop presenters, good test developers, good classroom observers, good report writers, and good statisticians, and all or most of these people should have at least some experience in elementary and secondary schools. At the same time, since all of the work is contractual, the staffing pattern has to be flexible enough to get the above jobs done and still respond to the constantly changing budgetary picture. The staffing pattern that has emerged is a combination of full-time staff members (two), and part-time contractual consultants (six). Each staff member has specialized in one or two areas (e.g., proficiency tests, Migrant Education, Staff Development, Bilingual Education, Compensatory Education, etc.). Staff members frequently team-up on the evaluation of specific projects. However, on occasion, each staff member must perform tasks outside his/her area of specialization. Obviously, in addition to being highly skilled evaluators, staff members must also demonstrate the ability to be flexible.

Managing the EIP Center presents some special problems. Most of the districts asking for competent evaluation help are small -- under 1,500 A.D.A. A district might contract for help for daily rates plus expenses. However, more often, the Center bids competitively on federal or state-funded programs which

have mandated evaluation components. Since the programs are small, most contracts are under $3,000. At one time, the Center had some 70 contracts, each for less than $3,000. Management by evaluation objectives is a necessity. Thus, for every evaluation contract, a management plan is developed which shows program evaluation objectives, specific evaluation activities, timeline, and person responsible. Actually such plans were adapted right out of the EIP Manual so that the Director and staff are in essence practicing what they preach.

The use of management plans works extremely well. At staff meetings, contracts and their degree of implementation are easily monitored by the Director and staff. The plans help to prevent duplication of effort and promote coordination of various evaluations. Most of all, they serve to promote communication among staff and a team approach to problem solving.

Overall, the operation of the Center has been very successful. Each year we receive numerous requests for services (i.e., workshops, consultation, conducting an evaluation) with only minimal dissemination efforts on the part of the Center's staff. Frequently we receive more requests for services than we can provide. In these cases, we resort to regional workshops or refer the request to another service provider (e.g., Chapter I TAC, State University, etc.). With the current emphasis on accountability and student achievement, the future appears to offer many opportunities to provide services to educators throughout the region.

EVALUATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES	TIMEFRAME												PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DATA SOURCE
		JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG		

THE MANAGEMENT, OPERATION, AND STAFFING OF AN EIP CENTER

Randall Cognetta
San Mateo County Office of Education

The San Mateo EIP Center provides inservice and consulting in program evaluation and in evaluation-related areas to K-12 school district personnel in nine San Francisco Bay Area counties. The EIP Director is also the Director of Planning, Development and Evaluation (P.D. & E.) in the San Mateo County Office of Education. The Director uses two members of the P.D. & E. staff, an Evaluator/Testing Analyst and a Program Coordinator to assist with some of the EIP activities.

At the beginning of the school year approximately 900 letters announcing the availabiiity of EIP services are sent to the County Offices of Education and most of the school districts in the San Mateo Center's service region. A copy of the letter is presented below.

California
Evaluation Improvement Program

July 16, 1984

Superintendents,
and Directors of Instruction

The California Evaluation Improvement Program (EIP) was established in 1974 by the Office of Program Evaluation and Research of the State Department of Education to assist educators in evaluating their programs for the purpose of program improvement. EIP Centers have been established throughout the state in eight county offices, forming a network capable of serving California's 1,043 local educational agencies. Since its inception ten years ago, approximately 6,000 persons a year have received training and/or consultant assistance from the network.

The San Mateo Center, housed in the San Mateo County Office of Education, provides service to school districts in nine Bay Area counties. We are prepared to offer workshops or consultations in the following areas:

- evaluating school programs
- assessing needs
- evaluating staff development programs
- assessing affective growth
- assessing school climate
- assessing time on task
- identifying, assessing and assessing program effectiveness
- developing and evaluating JTPA programs

If you would like more information or would like to schedule a meeting to plan to use our services, please call Randall A. Cognetta, EIP Director, at (415)363-5452.

There are no charges for our services or workshop materials.

Sincerely,

Randall A. Cognetta, Ed.D.,
Director, Evaluation Improvement Program

BEST COPY

Also at the beginning of a school year a schedule of EIP workshops is planned for the entire year and notices sent to districts in the service region. A copy of the schedule is presented below.

Evaluation Improvement Program

SAN MATEO CENTER

WORKSHOP SERIES FOR 1984-85

	SESSIONS	DATE/TIME	PLACE
1.	ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL *Processes and materials to identify and measure the effectiveness of a school in relation to the literature's "effectiveness" factors.*	October 3, 1984 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Holbrook Palmer Park (see map on reverse side)
2.	NEEDS ASSESSMENTS AND PLANNING FOR SIP SCHOOLS *How to develop plans for a needs assessment and how to use the results to develop objectives/activities for a multi-year SIP plan. Special emphasis will be given to newly funded SIP schools which will be developing their first SIP plans.*	October 17, 1984 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Holbrook Palmer Park
3.	ELEMENTARY (K-8) PROGRAM REVIEW (2-day) *How to develop a team approach for an elementary program review as required by Senate Bill 1155 and the State Department of Education.*	November 7-8 1984 9 a.m to 4 p.m.	Holbrook Palmer Park
4.	PROGRAM EVALUATION *Materials and processes developed by the Evaluation Improvement Program (EIP). The EIP model is generic and can be used for any district/school program evaluation.*	December 5, 1984 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Holbrook Palmer Park
5.	PROFICIENCY TEST REVIEW *A review of proficiency test mandates along with examples of test development and test reporting procedures.*	January 16, 1985 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Holbrook Palmer Park
6.	MEASURING SCHOOL CLIMATE *How to adapt existing instruments/processes to measure your district/school climate and how to collect/use the school climate data*	February 20, 1985 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Holbrook Palmer Park
7.	EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS *Presentation of an evaluation model that includes effects on students, as well as participant reactions, as elements for evaluation.*	March 20, 1985 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Holbrook Palmer Park
8.	USING MICROCOMPUTERS FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES *Data analysis/reporting as used by the County Office for staff development and proficiency test activities. Participants are asked to bring copies of their products/processes to share.*	April 17, 1985 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Holbrook Palmer Park

****

BEST COPY

The great majority of school districts served by the San Mateo Center are located in heavily populated, urban areas. As a result, many of the districts are large enough to employ staff who are knowledgeable in evaluation and evaluation-related areas. Thus, requests for service, in many cases, are for a specific and limited topic. For example, a special education administrator and his head resource teacher requested a meeting in order to clarify sample selection for a special education study. After consulting with our EIP staff, they were in a position to complete their study without further assistance.

Middle management staff members from the larger districts usually are selective and attend an EIP scheduled workshop that is related specifically to their areas of responsibility. Someone in charge of proficiency tests will attend the Proficiency Test Review Workshop; some responsible for the School Improvement Program will attend the Elementary (K-8) Program Review Workshop.

The EIP workshop sessions included in the schedule for the year are varied in order to offer "something for everybody." Those workshops, however, are also available for presentation in school districts that request inservice sessions in their own areas.

At times the EIP staff is asked to help design questionnaires or interview scales and at times the staff is asked to plan a school climate study. For some of the small school districts the staff is asked to prepare or revise proficiency tests and to discuss test results with the school board. Helping the small school district personnel and community understand the California Assessment Program (CAP) results, after they appear in the newspapers, is an annual activity for the EIP staff.

The EIP Center Director attempts to maintain a balance between the instructional or inservice activities and actual "hands-on" experiences in the schools. The "how you could do it" is related to the "how we did it."

In addition to the workshops and consulting in the areas indicated above, the EIP staff provides complete evaluation services on a cost recovery basis.

Example of programs evaluated include the following:

- San Mateo Title VII Bilingual Consortium
- Bilingual Language Training Program
- Packard Foundation Music Program
- Special Education Special Study
- American Indian Project
- Home Economy and Regional Occupation Program
- Parents as Learners
- Suicide Prevention Program

The San Mateo EIP Center has become an integral part of the Planning, Development and Evaluation Program of the San Mateo County Office of Education. The fact that the EIP personnel are primarily employees of the County Office helps to foster acceptance of, and confidence in, the EIP program.

RESPONDING TO EMERGING NEEDS:

THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA)

Jack Thompson
Sonoma County Office of Education

I. BACKGROUND

A. One of State Priorities

B. Funds Provided Each EIP Center for Evaluation and Counseling/Guidance Service to JTPA (SDA's and LEA's).

II. INITIAL SERVICES (2/1 - 7/1/84)

A. Personal Contacts with SDA directors and selected LEA's for Joint Needs Assessment and Service Alternatives

B. Individual Differences in EIP Center Areas

1. SDA/LEA attitude
2. Geographical factors
3. Readiness level
4. Differences in needs

D. Outcomes Between 2/15 and 7/1

1. Over 1,500 persons serviced
2. Changes evidenced by:
   a. willingness to apply principles of evaluation to programs
   b. requests from participants for follow-up evaluation assistance
   c. awareness of need to develop specific objectives and competencies for JTPA program

III. FUTURE ACTIVITIES (dependent upon funding)

A. Further Training Workshops

1. Examples
   a. developing clear competency statements
   b. individual assessment alternatives

III. (continued)

c. program evaluation strategies

d. program planning and needs assessment

B. Consultation/Technical Assistance

1. Review evaluation in program proposals

2. Selection of assessment

3. Report writing

4. Use of evaluation data for program decision-making

C. Development

1. Instrument development

2. Modify training to fit specific needs

3. Evaluation plan development

DEVELOPING EVALUATION TEACHING MATERIALS

Aniello L. Malvetti
Sacramento County Office of Education

The project began as an effort to develop a generic training package for middle level managers, i.e., principals, coordinators, directors, etc. The purpose was to provide participants with practical yet comprehensive training and resources for conducting program evaluation. Materials were designed to be useful across a variety of programs rather than being linked to one particular type. An emphasis was placed on experiential learning -- after a brief lecture/discussion participants would be engaged in an activity which involved applying the concepts just covered. Special care was taken in minimizing the technical and obscure and emphasizing the practical and understandable. These development efforts combined the talents of both curriculum and evaluation specialists and yielded a very well-received workshop guide and supplemental materials. Initial planning for the materials included educators from throughout the state as well as some national figures.

From this initial generic training package EIP moved in the direction of developing more specialized products. The development process varies somewhat for each product but nonetheless follows a similar theme. The assessment of needs initiates the process and may take various forms. One approach is for EIP directors to engage in a group process to identify and prioritize training needs. Developers are then selected to prepare proposals to address a critical need. A second approach is for one or more of the EIP directors to identify and prepare a proposal for a training package. This proposal is presented to the EIP directors and discussed. Another approach is to have a need identified by the State Department of Education. This is then translated into a proposal and presented to the EIP directors. In each of these cases, proposals (including budgets) are discussed by the committee of all EIP directors and a decision is

made regarding funding. With approval, authors proceed with the development activity.

The next step is to prepare a draft for field testing the materials. Initial versions of the product are developed and shared with EIP as well as non-EIP colleagues. Written and oral critiques are encouraged and utilized for revisions. Attention is paid to the content of the material as well as the effectiveness of the learning activities. After incorporating revisions based on this feedback, the field test version is prepared. Field tests are then conducted using audiences similar to those for whom the products are ultimately intended. Field tests end with written evaluations by participants and a brief feedback discussion session.

The field test experiences are then synthesized and utilized in the next revisions of the documents. Final review of the products are then conducted by colleagues and preparation for printing follows. When training packages become available they are used in conducting workshops throughout the state.

The following training materials have been, or are being, produced by the California Evaluation Improvement Program:

- Program Evaluator's Guide
- Workshop on Program Evaluation
- Guide to Special Education Program Evaluation
- Developing Useful Objectives
- Measuring and Evaluating Affective Growth in School Programs
- Evaluating Staff Development Programs
- Program Evaluation for School Boards and School Site Councils
- Measuring School Climate
- Evaluating School Effectiveness